



1 For

1374.32049RV1 / 329201392US4

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): KAJIHARA, et al.  
Serial No.: 09/987,978  
Filed: November 16, 2001  
For: LEAD FRAME SEMICONDUCTOR INTEGRATED CIRCUIT  
DEVICE, USING THE SAME, AND METHOD OF AND  
PROCESS FOR FABRICATING THE TWO  
Group: 2815  
Examiner: J. Clark  
Conf. No.: 7905

**REQUEST FOR COMPLETE OFFICE ACTION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

15 May 2006

Sir:

Upon review of the 20 March 2006 Office Action, it has been determined that the Office Action cannot be understood for the reason that the Office Action is not responsive to the Response filed on November 1, 2004. A copy of the Response and postcard receipt are enclosed as proof of filing thereof.

Applicants request that the period for response be reset in accordance with the mail date of the complete Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

Paul J. Skwierawski  
Registration No. 32,173

PJS/slk  
(703) 312-6600



501.32049RV1/329201392US4

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant : Yujiro KAJIHARA *et al.*  
Serial No. : 09/987,978  
Filed : 16 November 2001  
For : LEAD FRAME SEMICONDUCTOR INTEGRATED  
CIRCUIT DEVICE, USING THE SAME, AND METHOD  
OF AND PROCESS FOR FABRICATING THE TWO  
Art Unit : 2815  
Examiner : J.B. Clark  
Conf. No. : 7905

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

**Mail Stop Reissue**  
Commissioner for Patents  
POB 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

1 November 2004

Sir:

In response to the *ex parte Quayle* Office Action was mailed 9 September 2004 in connection with the above-identified application, Applicant submits the following response, remarks and attachments.

**PENDING/ALLOWED CLAIMS**

Claims 15-27 were pending, under consideration and subject to examination in the Office Action, and are allowed in this application, as indicated at Item 5 in the Office Action Summary Form PTOL-326 and at Item 1 at page 2 of the Action. Applicant and the undersigned respectfully thank the Examiner for such indication of allowance.

### **SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION - SUBMITTED/TRAVERSED**

As previously made in this application, Items 1 and 2 on page 2 of the Action again indicate that a Supplemental Reissue Oath or Declaration is required. The improper requirement in the present Action does not identify any claims being rejected as based on a defective Declaration, and again, no proper grounds are given for the requirement and no identification of any alleged specific error that is not covered in the original Reissue Declaration is made. As always done previously, Applicant again respectfully traverses the requirement for a Supplemental Reissue Declaration because, as Applicant has always previously proven and as has never been challenged or even addressed in any of the Office Communications, no proper grounds exist for imposition of such a requirement.

However, in order to travel a path of least resistance to gain allowance of the present application at last, and to overcome the improper delays and retractions by the Office, Applicant submits herewith, under protest of improper examination, an executed Supplemental Reissue Declaration to satisfy the requirement for same.

The above statements and the filing of any Supplemental Reissue Declaration should not be taken as an indication or admission that any of the rejections were ever valid, but is merely use of a procedural approach to obviate the rejection.

### **RESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

It is respectfully submitted that any and all claim amendments and/or cancellations submitted within this paper and throughout prosecution of the present